	OUTING AND	RECOR	D SHEET
SUBJECT: (Optional):			
FROM: EA/EXDLT: 7D55 HQS			NO.
			DATE 0 1 MAR 1982
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED FORWARDS	OFFICER'S	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Chuck Wilson OPA 1F06 HOS	3		Attached is Chuck Briggs' suggestion. Takea look at it and let me know what you think before
2.			I pass it in to John. I will be glad to include your comments.
-3-			SI
4			
5.			
6.	Apple 1. And 2.		
7			
8.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

26 February 1982

PROPOSED MODEL

- -- No new "boxes."
- -- PRB continue <u>except</u> receive policy guidance from, and forward unresolved issues to, the IRC rather than the DDCI. (This requires HR revision)
- -- (Preferred step but removable for later consideration if it would negate the above: have PRB staff support, i.e. manuscript review for sanitizing, be done by DDA/OIS with present/former DO staffers and/or DO annuitants)

-- Other comments:

- a. OGC advisory role should not dominate -- among other things, suggest review of the somewhat provocative procedure of manuscript submission to OGC rather than Chairman, PRB and correspondence with OGC prior to there being any indication of a legal issue.
- b. No reason to suspect PRB would have to seek IRC assistance/involvement except in highly unusual difficult cases -- which is exactly when PRB or DDCI should welcome it. No real turf problem.

(Ultimately, the PRB could be abolished and manuscript review could be a specialized branch of OIS, provided it was handled creatively, helping assumed friendly former employees find alternatives to difficult passages. Disaffected employees are an entirely different kind of cupcake, requiring dispassionate, professional application of the relevant regulations, executive orders or laws.)

STAT STAT